



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 3, 2012

Mr. Norman Ray Giles
Counsel for the City of Arcola
Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Aughtry
1200 Smith Street, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2012-15762

Dear Mr. Giles:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 466705.

The City of Arcola and the Arcola Police Department (collectively, the "city"), which you represent, received a request for eleven categories of information. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); ORD 551 at 4. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The requestor states he has been retained to represent a named employee in a wrongful termination claim against the city. You state, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor has filed a lawsuit against the city. However, we note the petition was filed six days after the city received the request for information. Thus, we find you have failed to establish that litigation was pending on the date the city received the request for information. We also understand you to contend the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request because the requestor states in his request that the reinstatement of the

²In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

named employee to full active duty will "alleviate the imposition of further litigation." Based on your representation, our review, and the totality of circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received and the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation. We therefore conclude the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. See ORD 551 at 4-5. Therefore, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, a section 552.103(a) interest no longer exists as to that information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Nneka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/bhf

Ref: ID# 466705

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.